

Remarks

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested.

Applicants respectfully thank the Examiner for extending the courtesy of a telephonic interview with Applicants' representative on October 4, 2007. Applicants' representative found the Examiner's comments very helpful and instructive. Applicants also thank the Examiner for the allowance of claims 15-33.

Upon entry of the foregoing amendments, claims 1-36 are pending in the application, with claims 1, 15, 22, 23, 27, and 34 being the independent claims. By this Amendment, Applicants seek to amend claims 1 and 34. These changes are believed to introduce no new matter, and their entry is respectfully requested.

Based on the above amendment and the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1-14 and 34-36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. Sec. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Claims 1 and 14 have been amended and to more clearly comply with the written description requirement. Applicants, therefore, respectfully request that the rejection of claims 1 and 14, under 35 U.S.C. Sec. 112, be withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-3, 11-12, 14, and 34-26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. Sec. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McCormack et al. (US Patent 6,535,983) in view of Campardo

et al. (US Patent 5,886,925). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 1-3, 11-12, 14, and 34-26.

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, all of the claimed features must be taught or suggested by the references and there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings, MPEP Section 2142.

Applicants respectfully submit that the combined teachings of McCormack and Campardo fail to teach or suggest the claimed invention. In particular, the combination of references fails to teach or suggest a communications device including a relay having native devices, wherein gates of the native devices are grounded when power is applied to the relay, the grounding thereby opening the relay, as recited in claims 1 and 34. These features are discussed, for example, in Applicants' specification at paragraphs 0010, 0013, and 0052-0053, and are illustrated in FIG. 5a.

Therefore, assuming *arguendo*, that one would be motivated to combine these references in the manner suggested by the Office Action, the present invention would not be obvious in view of such combinations. The suggested combinations would not result in the presently claimed invention reciting a communications device including a relay having native devices, wherein gates of the native devices are grounded when power is applied to the relay, the grounding thereby opening the relay a communications device including a relay having native devices, wherein gates of the native devices are grounded when power is applied to the relay, the grounding thereby opening the relay.

In view of the above arguments, it is clear that the present invention would not have been rendered obvious by the suggested combinations to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention. Therefore, claims 1 and 34 are allowable under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being patentable, either alone or in combination, over McCormack and Campardo.

Claims 2-14 depend from claim 1 and claims 35-36 depend from claim 34. Therefore, claims 2-14 and 35-36 are allowable at least for the reasons claims 1 and 34 are allowable, and for the specific features recited therein.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicants believe that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.



Theodore A. Wood
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 52,374

Date: 9 Oct 07

1100 New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005-3934
(202) 371-2600

729765_1.DOC